

National Forest Service, Forest Plan Revision  
Preliminary “Need To Change” January workshops  
Tribal Input Report  
**Inyo National Forest Tribal Meeting**  
January 30, 2014

Prepared by the Center for Collaborative Policy

## Contents

Introduction .....	1
Input by topic area .....	2
1. Eastside vegetation, resilience, wildlife, invasive plants, and fire .....	2
Refinements.....	2
2. Wildland Urban Interface .....	3
3. Meadows .....	3
4. Aquatic and Riparian .....	3
5. Sustainable Recreation .....	3
Desired conditions .....	3
6. Other / Overarching .....	3
Conclusion / Major Themes.....	4

## Introduction

The Inyo National Forest (INF) Tribal Meeting regarding the Forest Plan Revision preliminary “Need to Change” was held on January 28 at the Forest Supervisor’s Office in Bishop, CA. Eight individuals representing five tribes (Antelope Valley Indian Community, Big Pine Paiute Tribe, Bishop Paiute Tribe, and the Walker River Paiute Tribe) attended.

The meeting opened with a welcome from Mammoth Lakes District Ranger Jon Regelbrugge on behalf of Inyo Forest Supervisor Ed Armenta, who could not attend the meeting due to a death in his family. The agenda included opening remarks by Region 5 Tribal Coordinator Bob Goodwin and Sequoia and Sierra National Forests Tribal Liaison Dirk Charley; followed by presentations,

discussion, and questions and answers regarding Forest Plan Revision, the preliminary “Need to Change” document, desired conditions for the Forest, and the unique roles and contributions of the Forest. The presenters were members of the Regional Planning Team Deb Whittall, Acting Director of Planning for Forest Service Region 5; Jo Ann Fites-Kaufman, Ecologist, U.S. Forest Service; Mary Cole, Landscape Architect, Sequoia National Forest; and Mark Metcalfe, Economist, U.S. Forest Service. Meeting materials and presentations are posted to the Region 5 Planning website:

<http://www.fs.usda.gov/main/r5/landmanagement/planning>.

The purpose of this report is to assemble input received during the meeting, either verbally (as captured by staff note-takers) or on comment cards. Comments sent via email or post before or after the workshop will be assembled in a separate report.

This report was prepared by the Center for Collaborative Policy with the intent to neutrally categorize and summarize the input generated at the meeting.

## Input by topic area

Input received at the Inyo Tribal Meeting is organized by the 5 topic areas from the preliminary “Need to Change”, plus a category for “other / overarching” input. Within each section, comments are subdivided as either **refinements** to the Need to Change, **clarifications** of text in the Need to Change, “**missing**” from the Need to Change, statements of **desired conditions** for the Forest, or **project / activity specific input**. Subcategories in each topic area are only listed if input pertaining to that subcategory was received.

Two written comment cards were received at this meeting. Remarks from the comment cards are shown in quotation marks; diverse ideas submitted on a single comment card may appear in different topic areas as appropriate. All other input is derived from notes taken by Forest Service staff and the meeting facilitator.

### ***1. Eastside vegetation, resilience, wildlife, invasive plants, and fire***

#### **Refinements**

- Tribes would like to co-manage the forest and pass on traditional ways of management. They can find money in tribal grants to be able to help the Forest Service.
- “Native people need to be included in the monitoring evaluation process.”
- “Land stewardship with tribes.”

- Collaborate on evaluation and monitoring. Who is better to be out there? We know the roads, we know our lands. We hunt and gather and know these areas.
- Mother Nature doesn't wait. She forces your hand and changes what you're trying to fix.
- "Sage grouse habitat." (Needs protection)

## **2. *Wildland Urban Interface***

## **3. *Meadows***

## **4. *Aquatic and Riparian***

## **5. *Sustainable Recreation***

### **Desired conditions**

- Concern over non-local input, e.g. skiers, people with condos. Locals have to live with the results, and sometimes we like things the way they are. People just want to make money. They will love the Forest to death (overuse).

## **6. *Other / Overarching***

- "Access Roads need tribal input – traditional trails need to be avoided. Youth involvement – Jr. Program with forest service. Tribal council/ THPO (Tribal Historic Preservation Officer) unified meetings. I appreciate the Forest Service **having this tribal forum.**"
- "Cultural Sites – protecting. Gathering sites – protecting. Clear cutting ancestral gathering grounds. Protected gathering sites – protecting."
- The planning documents are so fragmented. The Indian perspective is more integrated.
- It is hard to review the planning documents in short periods of time since the tribes are short-staffed.
- There are so many unfinished projects. How can you do a revision, jumping over the projects that are still undone? Tribes are not satisfied with current projects.
- Help our youth be involved with the Forest Service so they can make a future.
- How many trees did you cut down to make handouts for this meeting? (Use less paper.)

### ***Conclusion / Major Themes***

At this Inyo Tribal Meeting, the overarching themes were a desire for more local tribal involvement in forest management, evaluation, and monitoring, and protection of cultural sites and uses.